

REMARKS

New dependent claims 35-42 are support by the application such as at p. 10, lines 20-22 and original claims 7, 9, 11-17 and 32.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 1-3 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Park et al. (US 2003/0044727).

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. in view of Chiu et al.

Independent Claim 20 recites,

“A PDP back surface plate comprising a substrate having formed thereon a rib pattern layer having a rib region having ribs having a predetermined shape and a predetermined size and a non-rib region occupying at least a part of a peripheral portion of said rib region, wherein a thin film made of the same material as that of said ribs is formed to a predetermined thickness in said non-rib region.”

With regard to Claim 20, the Examiner cited paragraph 30, lines 1-10, as allegedly teaching the feature of a “non-rib region occupying at least a part of a peripheral portion of said rib region, wherein a thin film made of the same material as that of said ribs is formed to a predetermined thickness in said non-rib region”.

Paragraph 30 of Park et al. recites, “Then, liquid silicon rubber material (for example, SH9555 of Dow Corning Company, in which silicon solution and hardening agent are mixed in the ratio of 5.about.15:1) is poured to the basic mold frame, and after air bubbles are removed, the mold frame is hardened in the oven at about 50 degrees C. for around 30 minutes. The

hardened silicon rubber is separated from the basic mold frame, and thus the soft mold is obtained.”

The Applicants submits that this paragraph concerns a flexible mold, and not a PDP back surface plate. The Applicant would like to bring to the Examiner’s attention that Fig. 6C of Parks et al. clearly depicts barrier ribs 61 on rear glass substrate 60. The non-rib region occupying the peripheral portion of the rib region clearly lacks a thin film made of the same material as that of the ribs.

Independent Claim 1 recites a flexible mold suitable for making the PDP back panel, such as the PDP back panel of Claim 20. The Examiner alleges that Paragraph 30, lines 1-5 and reference numerals 60 and 61 of Figures 6a and 6c of Parks et al. teaches all the claim limitations.

As just discussed, reference numerals 60 and 61 depict barrier ribs on a glass substrate. Thus, these figures relate to a PDP back panel and not a flexible mold.

Although paragraph 30 relate to a flexible mold, such paragraph does not describe a non-rib region.

The Applicant would like to bring to the Examiner’s attention that the peripheral portion of the rib region of the mold of Park et al. is illustrated by reference numeral 32 of Fig. 3C and reference numeral 42 of Fig. 4A-4C. **In Fig. 4A, the thickness of the peripheral portion is depicted as being the same thickness as the planar portion that connects the grooves.**

However, with reference to Fig. 9 of Applicant’s patent application and the detailed description at p. 9, line 27 to p. 10, line 22, the thickness of the molding layer 11a of the non-rib region is preferably smaller than the thickness of the rib formation portion (though it is not shown in the drawing.) It is this reduced thickness in the non-rib region that produces the thin film.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite the structural features in relation to the flexible mold, rather than in relation to what is being molded.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

September 10, 2007

Date

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833

By: /Carolyn A. Fischer/

Carolyn A. Fischer, Reg. No.: 39,091
Telephone No.: 651-575-3915